

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/801,139		HAEFNER, PAUL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	MICHAEL KAHELIN		3762	

All Participants:

(1) MICHAEL KAHELIN.

(2) Paul Sherburne.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

25 and 35

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Michael Kahelin/
Examiner, Art Unit 3762

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11am

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner telephonically requested election to the restriction included herewith. The examiner indicated that, should the device claim be broadened to indicate that the "discriminating" step can be performed by either the IMD or the programmer, or the method claim limited to indicate that the "discriminating" step can be performed only by the IMD, all claims will be examined. No election was made.